



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/019,330 | 03/07/2002 | Mihaly Toth | 872.0235,UI(US) | 6246 |
| 29683 | 7590 | 11/20/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212 | | | AVELLINO, JOSEPH E | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2143 | | |

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 10/019,330 | Applicant(s) TOTH ET AL. |
| | Examiner Joseph E. Avellino | Art Unit 2143 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). **ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION.** See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: arguments presented are not persuasive (see continuation sheet).

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Applicant's arguments dated October 27, 2006 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argues, in substance, that (1) Freund does not disclose assigning multiple transactions to a single thread, (2) there is no motivation to combine Bayeh with Freund, (3) combining Freund with Bayeh would render Bayeh inoperable.

As to point (1) it is the client requests, not the transactions, that the Office is stating is divided amongst the threads. The requests are divided up amongst the various threads based on the transaction identifiers. These transaction identifiers can be used to group like requests together such that all requests that are related can be executed on the same thread. In this sense multiple sessions (i.e. requests) belonging to the same transaction can be grouped together on a single thread. The transaction can be construed as the entire group of requests that are assigned to a specific thread. By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

As to point (2), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, sufficient motivation can be found in the Final Rejection, dated August 9, 2006, page 3. By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

As to point (3), the Office disagrees. Bayeh discloses that the sessions are distributed using load balancing algorithms commonly known in the art (see Final Rejection). The system of Freund is another type of load balancing system by distributing transactions across multiple threads ("...intermediate requests belonging to another transaction...are not allowed to be processed on a transaction's execution thread" Freund: col. 6, lines 50-55), not only would this ensure consistent data integrity, but it also reduces the likelihood that threads will become overwhelmed, by distributing transactions over multiple execution threads. The system of Bayeh can utilize the system of Freund as the "balancing policies implemented in the load-balancing host software", thereby ensuring that similar sessions can be routed to the same servlet on the web server. By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

A handwritten mark consisting of two intersecting diagonal lines forming an 'X' shape, with a small loop or flourish on the left side.